



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/717,884

11/20/2003

Ross W. Duncan

10758.00

9400

26889 7590 03/12/2008

MICHAEL CHAN
NCR CORPORATION
1700 SOUTH PATTERSON BLVD
DAYTON, OH 45479-0001

EXAMINER

CHANKONG, DOHM

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2152

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/12/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/717,884	Applicant(s) DUNCAN, ROSS W.	
	Examiner DOHM CHANKONG	Art Unit 2152	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>3/26/04, 9/27/05</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

- 1> Claims 1-19 are presented for examination.
- 2> This is a non-final rejection.

Priority

- 3> Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Specification

- 4> The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: claim 7 recites a term, a “program storage medium,” that was not described in Applicant’s specification.

Claim Objections

- 5> Claims 2-6, 8-10, 12-15, 18, and 19 objected to because of the following informalities: claims 2-6 should be amended to refer to “the software agent” rather than “a software agent” since these dependent claims are referring to the software agent claimed in claim 1. Similar remarks apply to the other dependent claims. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6> Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 1 is directed to a script engine. Applicant's specification does not describe whether the script engine is implemented as hardware (i.e., a machine or a manufacture), software, or a combination of both. The specification does describe the script engine as being "executable" [pg. 4 «lines 23»]. Based on this description, one of ordinary skill in the art could reasonably interpret the script engine as being implemented as software *per se* because software programs and not hardware components are generally "executable." Since the script engine is directed to software *per se*, the claims are rejected for claiming non-statutory subject matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 2152

7> Note that this action sets forth two different grounds of rejection with different prior art references for claims 1-16 to illustrate that these claims are so broadly written as to allow multiple interpretations.

8> Claims 1-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Drummond et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,970,846 ["Drummond"].

9> As to claim 1, Drummond discloses a script engine adapted to provide a direct communication link between a browser agent and a software agent [column 19 «lines 40-61» where : Drummond's common gateway interface (CGI) reads on Applicant's claimed script engine and Drummond's back office computer system reads on the software agent. The CGI provides a link between the browser 76 and the back office].

10> As to claim 2, Drummond discloses the script engine configured to receive a request from the web browser for data or functionality available from the software agent and transmit the request to the software agent [column 19 «lines 40-50» : client inputting a request on the touch screen for a certain amount of funds from the back office computer system].

11> As to claim 3, Drummond discloses the script engine configured to receive a response from the software agent, and transmit the response to the web browser in a format that can be recognized thereby [column 32 «lines 13-30» : taking the information from the back office

Art Unit: 2152

computer (“receive function command messages”) and translate the function command messages into TCP/IP messages for use by the browser].

12> As to claim 4, Drummond discloses the script engine configured to translate the request from the web browser to a format that can be interpreted by the software agent [column 19 «lines 46-50» | column 36 «lines 15-20 and 55-62» | column 38 «line 58» to column 39 «line 31» where : Drummond discloses submitting an HTTP request from the browser which is converted into a conventional ATM request for the back office computer systems to access the bank information].

13> As to claim 5, Drummond discloses the script engine configured to translate the software agent response to a format that can be interpreted by the web browser [column 32 «lines 22-26» | column 36 «lines 20-26»].

14> As to claim 6, Drummond discloses the format interpretable by the web browser is HTML [column 19 «lines 40-50» | column 36 «lines 20-26»].

15> Claim 7 is directed to a method stored on a storage medium that implements the steps for executing the functionality of the script engine as claimed in claims 1 and 2. Therefore, claim 7 is rejected for at least the same reasons set forth for claims 1 and 2.

Art Unit: 2152

16> Claims 8-10 are directed to methods stored on a storage medium that implement the steps for executing the functionality of the script engine as claimed in claims 3-5 respectively. Therefore, claim 8-10 are rejected for at least the same reasons set forth for claims 3-5.

17> Claim 11 is directed to a method that implements the steps for executing the functionality of the script engine as claimed in claims 1, 2, and 4. Therefore claim 11 is rejected for at least the same reasons set forth for claims 1, 2, and 4.

18> Claims 12-15 are directed to methods that implement the steps for executing the functionality of the script engine as claimed in claims 3-6 respectively. Therefore, claim 12-15 are rejected for at least the same reasons set forth for claims 3-6.

19> As to claim 16, Drummond discloses a self-service terminal comprising:
a web browser [Figure 2 «item 76»]; and
a script engine for providing a direct communication link between the web browser and a software agent based system [column 32 «lines 15-30» : the CGI can be implemented within either the ATM or at the script engine.

20> As to claim 17, Drummond discloses an automated teller machine (ATM) comprising:
a web browser [Figure 2 «item 76» | column 7 «lines 13-19»];

Art Unit: 2152

display means for displaying a link in a web page in the web browser to allow an ATM customer to request banking information by selecting the link [column 4 «lines 34-36» | column 7 «line 66» to column 8 «line 10»]; and

a script engine including (i) means for receiving a request for banking information from the ATM customer when the ATM customer selects the link in the web page in the web browser [column 26 «lines 19-31» | column 32 «lines 15-30»], and (ii) means for transmitting the request from the web browser to a software agent to allow the software agent to provide data associated with the banking information requested by the ATM customer [column 26 «lines 32-54»].

21> Claim 18 is directed to an ATM that implements the steps for executing the functionality of the script engine of claims 4 and 5. Therefore claim 18 is rejected for at least the same reasons set forth for claims 4 and 5.

22> Claim 19 is directed to an ATM that implements the steps for executing the functionality of the script engine of claim 6. Therefore claim 19 is rejected for at least the same reasons set forth for claim 6.

23> Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated over Junkerman, U.S. Patent No. 7,296,226.

Art Unit: 2152

24> As to claim 1, Junkerman discloses a script engine adapted to provide a direct communication link between a web browser and a software agent [Figure 1 where : Junkerman's business services layer reads on the claimed script agent and the back-end systems layer reads on the claimed software agent | column 4 «lines 8-63»].

25> As to claim 2, Junkerman discloses the script engine configured to receive a request from the web browser for data or functionality available from the software agent and transmit the request to the software agent [Figure 1].

26> As to claim 3, Junkerman discloses the script engine further configured to receive a response from the software agent, and transmit the response to the web browser in a format that can be recognized thereby [Figure 1 | column 11 «lines 1-24» : translating the DOM document received from the software agent to HTML text].

27> As to claim 4, Junkerman discloses the script engine configured to translate the request from the web browser to a format that can be interpreted by the software agent [Figure 1 : translating the request to an input message | column 8 «lines 12-24»].

28> As to claim 5, Junkerman discloses the script engine configured to translate the software agent response to a format that can be interpreted by the web browser [column 4 «lines 10-15» | column 11 «lines 12-14»].

Art Unit: 2152

29> As to claim 6, Junkerman discloses the format interpretable by the web browser is HTML [column 11 «lines 12-14»].

30> Claim 7 is directed to a method stored on a storage medium that implements the steps for executing the functionality of the script engine as claimed in claims 1 and 2. Therefore, claim 7 is rejected for at least the same reasons set forth for claims 1 and 2.

31> Claims 8-10 are directed to methods stored on a storage medium that implement the steps for executing the functionality of the script engine as claimed in claims 3-5 respectively. Therefore, claim 8-10 are rejected for at least the same reasons set forth for claims 3-5.

32> Claim 11 is directed to a method that implements the steps for executing the functionality of the script engine as claimed in claims 1, 2, and 4. Therefore claim 11 is rejected for at least the same reasons set forth for claims 1, 2, and 4.

33> Claims 12-15 are directed to methods that implement the steps for executing the functionality of the script engine as claimed in claims 3-6 respectively. Therefore, claim 12-15 are rejected for at least the same reasons set forth for claims 3-6.

34> As to claim 16, Junkerman discloses a self-service terminal comprising:
a web browser [column 4 «lines 8-15»]; and

Art Unit: 2152

a script engine for providing a direct communication link between the web browser and a software agent based system [Figure 1 where : Junkerman's business services layer reads on the claimed script agent and the back-end systems layer reads on the claimed software agent | column 4 «lines 8-63»].

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following art are all related to providing an engine that translates responses and requests between browsers and a backend software system.

Kwang et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,962,327 - Figure 2;

Grandcolas et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,867,153 - Figure 1;

Zeanah et al, U.S. Patent No. 5,933,816 - abstract;

Covert et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,334,117 - abstract;

Bennett, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002|0026426 - Figure 1;

Antonin et al, U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002|0032655 - abstract ;

Richards et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,539,361 - abstract;

Drummond et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,598,023 - abstract;

Burgess, U.S. Patent No. 6,687,874 - Figure 1;

Kirschner et al, U.S. Patent No. 2004|0010597 - Figure 1;

Brown et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,944,665 - column 3 «lines 45-57»;

Drummond et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,062,464 - abstract;

Grandcolas et al, U.S. Patent No. 7,233,925 - Figure 1.

Art Unit: 2152

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DOHM CHANKONG whose telephone number is (571)272-3942. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday [8:30 AM to 4:30 PM].

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bunjob Jaroenchonwanit can be reached on 571.272.3913. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Dohm Chankong/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2152
(temporary partial signatory authority)